

## DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director  
50 W. Gay St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040  
(614) 645-8591  
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

**Tuesday, January 26, 2016**  
**77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)**

Planning Division  
50 W. Gay St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040  
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission  
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)  
Urban Design Manager  
(614) 645-8404  
[djthomas@columbus.gov](mailto:djthomas@columbus.gov)

### I. Attendance

Present: Robert Loversidge (Acting Chair), Michael Brown, Tedd Hardesty, Mike Lusk, Jana Maniace, Danni Palmore

Absent: Steve Wittmann (Chair), Otto Beatty, Jr., Kyle Katz

City Staff: Daniel Thomas, Steve Schoeney, Bud Braughton, Kelly Scocco, Ashley Senn, Dan McCann

Robert Loversidge acted as Chair in the absence of Steve Wittmann and Otto Beatty, Jr.

### II. Approval of the December 15, 2015 Downtown Commission Meeting Results

Move to approve (6-0)

### III. Conceptual Reviews

#### Case #1 16-1-1C

0:52:00

Address: 580 North Fourth Street

Smith Brothers Hardware

Applicant: Architectural Alliance

Property Owner: SBHI c/o Capitol Equities

Design Professional : Architectural Alliance

#### Request:

Conceptual review for an addition on the roof of the Smith Brothers Hardware Building. CC3359.05(C)1)

#### Discussion

Ty Kemmler – Smith Brothers was one of the first cases brought before the Commission in 1997. Stations were added to the roof in 1997 which will allow the addition of this roof top venue. Existing caterer on site (580 Dock) already with two venues and would expand. These venues are booked solid. Roof top would be open primarily on the weekend (Fri.- Sat.) Have explored other roof top venues around the country and found one in Chicago that would be similar. Retractable roof. Described off of video. Clear glass portion facing downtown. Would have bar as well as kitchen, in rear looking north. Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance – materials describe. DP – timeline? A – fall of this year. RL – this is awesome. Concerned about connection from elevator. A – would be covered, interior circulation is still being worked out. The floor of the venue would be about 5 ft. above the roof, the parapet being about 7 ft. The existing penthouse might have to be altered.

This is intended to be a 10 month a year venue, could be more. It is not a tax credit project. RL – when you come back I would like to see what it looks like from the ground. (view from the freeway, etc.) I think this is going to be great. JM – will venue look out (glass) at the water tower? It might be an added visual feature. A – will be able to see it through roof.

Have talked to the Convention Facility for possible use of the new parking garage, if need be. The venue would most like handle 300 or less in terms of capacity.

### **Result**

Conceptual only.

### **Case #1b**

#### **Presentation of ground floor patio near parking lot entrance.**

### **Discussion**

It was asked whether this could be viewed as a final submission, because of the relative minor nature of the proposal. The Commission was favorable about this proposal, but indicated that more detail needed to be submitted for final approval. Steel, echoing the existing material, is being looked at, with retractable roof. Perhaps look at signage and landscaping.

### **Result**

Conceptual only.

### **Case #2 16-1-5C**

1:10:00

**Address:** NE Corner Fourth & Long Streets

**Applicant:** Continental Real Estate

**Property Owner:** Continental Centre II, LLC (under negotiation with the City of Columbus)

**Attorney:** Rick Davis, Continental Real Estate

**Design Professional :** Adam Welker, Ford & Associates Architects

### **Request:**

Conceptual review for parking garage with ground floor commercial. Option 2 is to connected an apartment building to the east. CC3359.05(C)1), CC3359.23

*Would require the demolition of two existing buildings, 174 E. Long St. and 182 E. Long St.*

### **Discussion**

Steve Schoeny, Director of Development – described the City’s role. COAAA (Central Ohio Area Agency on Aging) occupied the existing buildings and they are moving to the South High St. An RFP was put out by the City on the existing COAAA site in Aug. 2015 under the condition that a developer would build a mixed use project with at least 650 garage parking spaces, in effort to deal with the current parking crunch in downtown. Continental put in a bid that was responsive. Final details are still being worked out. Transfer will likely occur in the next month or two. In terms of design review, that is the role of the Commission. Vacating Young St. is also anticipated.

Ford & Associates – Multi-story parking garage (670 cars), ground floor with new office space (30,000+ sf), projected to be Continental Office and Furnishings. This would be branded on the building, including the garage tower – vertical corner circulation element on the SW corner of the 4<sup>th</sup> Long intersection. Exterior lighting washing brick. Discussions for residential to the east. We are looking for conceptual comments regarding the parking structure and ground level office. Materials – precast garage, metal panels, masonry.

JM – massing is appropriate. One concern is the large mural space above parking garage. Visual interest on top of the building is valid, but I wonder if this can be achieved in another way. The CoMA is an attractive graphic, but what about less attractive graphic goes up? Are there other ways to treat the top? This would also be a primary façade where ad murals shouldn't be placed. I like overall massing and design. Think about the corner piece – it's material and lighting – will it be translucent, or have a screen. A. – the circulation tower is solid right now. RL – People might be uncomfortable in it, possibly introduce a glass element. A – the stairs at the Leveque tower are solid. RL – how does the bold red “Continental Parking” sign interact with the horizontal ad mural when the mural is for beer or whatever? CoMA is going to be as nice as it gets. Have you studied this with something that is less subtle. A – we have been working with Orange Barrel. FK - I don't like the way that typical garages are capped, this caps the garage and building. We're trying to make it look interesting. FA – we're also trying to avoid a top of garage with a sloped element, but rather have a horizontal element. We're showing screening on all of the floors. FK – there will be more detail with subsequent submission.

FK – when we bought the old Ohio Bell Bldg. (now the Continental Center) we had a lot of surface parking all around us. Jeff Edwards has now built the best looking projects around – 1,200 to 1,300 surface parking spaces have been wiped out. CDDC built a garage on 4<sup>th</sup> – that was soon filled. 56-62 E. Long (550 spaces) was closed. No parking and no hopes to get tenants. Discussions with the City about the COAAA site made it clear that the City didn't want their property east of Young St. to remain surface parking. That's how we came up with the residential component (135 units w/ ground floor retail) that we intend to do. RL, ML, MB – like the direction with the apartments. MB – Continental Office on the ground floor seems a little squashed under the weight of the parking garage. Couldn't you make the office portion a little more prominent in terms of the façade? FK – maybe do something clever with signage at the first floor to cover up parking. RL – my only concern is that we have to wrestle with the ad murals as part of a primary façade, building new buildings to accommodate that. You are doing this for a strong architectural reason. A – our examples were to use it for major institutional clients.

RL – the small two-story commercial building is kind of unique – some type of record and documentation would be desirable. ML – timing? FK – looking at start this July and move in July 2017. RL – we like it, you may want to come back for another conceptual when things are more defined (particularly the apartment portion). JM – How do you distinguish the residential entry.

## **Result**

Conceptual only.

**Case #3 16-1-2C**

1:30:47

**Address: 56-62 E. Long Street****Applicant and Property Owner:: 56 Long Street LLC****Design Professional : DesignGroup****Request:**

Conceptual review for the renovation of a parking structure (about 520 spaces to 560, if tandem). CC3359.05(C)1)

*A Building Order was issued by the City in September of 2013 to vacate the structure due to unsafe conditions and it has been vacant since. The structure recently changed ownership.*

**Discussion**

Brad DeHays - structural integrity is the most important component of the project. Structural investigation was done before purchase. Vertical columns showed structural integrity. Formed ways of stabilizing horizontal surfaces (carbon fiber reinforcement) and met with City Building Officials. New steel exterior skeleton was designed to reinforce existing cantilevered concrete decks and give building new look. Water, snow, salt and car movement have all taken their toll. Walls will be glass – some operable portions for ventilation. Other ventilation and air flow have also been addressed, as have been noise. The garage will be manned and attendants will be able to wash down garage.

Car wash on the front was originally considered as a service for people parking in the facility. There had been a car wash historically, and with Main Street car wash going away, this might provide a greater service. Circulation and curb cuts might be an issue. Accessing the wash on Long St. might create a stacking problem, there could be a way of leaving the cars parked to be gotten by valet, possibly off of the adjacent surface lot. City Traffic has not yet been approached.

RL – I'm pleased that this is not being torn down and made into surface parking. A new garage would not be done this way, but. . . Suggests that you study a limited site plan in terms of amount of curb cuts necessary and opportunities for streetscaping. There is an alley and one access point on the north side. This alley might be used on weekends for access into the garage when there are major event and an influx of visitors. TH -

The existing glass block is where the fire stairwell is. It should be replaced with a more transparent glass. Lighting (LED's) and changes in lighting is considered. DP – this could be an artistic opportunity, as well. The portion at grade to the west will be used for offices (3,400 sf).

Colors were discussed – steel members will be painted dark blue. Lots to the east and to the north are controlled by others, the applicant has had discussions with these owners.

The Commission expressed that the project would be a major improvement

**Result**

Conceptual only.

**Case #4 16-1-3C****1:57:00****Address:** 114 North Front Street (project, in total, also includes 31-53 w. Long St.)**Applicant and Property Owner:** Long Street Associates LLP**Design:** Genesis Planning & Design (storefront), Sandvick Architects (rooftop patio)**Request:**

Conceptual review for the storefront rehabilitation of 114 N. Front Street and the addition of a roof patio. Larger project also includes the renovation of three late 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> Century buildings (4, 7 & 3 stories) into apartments and street level retail (31-53 W. Long Street). CC3359.05(C)1)

**Discussion**

114 is not a historic project, the building fronting Long Street are (which are tax credit projects). Evo tiles will be used for the surface of the outdoor patio. The roof already has a generous parapet, precluding an additional structure. There will be movable plant boxes, a minimal approach. RL suggested to address all historical aspects with reviewers. A . it is already part of the Part II submission.

**Result**

Conceptual only.

**Case #5 16-1-4C****2:03:00****Address:** 260 South Fourth Street**Stoddart Block****Applicant and Property Owner:** Stoddart Block Limited Partnership**Design Professional :** Sandvick Architects**Request:**

Conceptual review for the storefront and sidewalk café. CC3359.05(C)1)

*The larger portion of the Stoddart Block project was approved by the Commission in May 2014.*

**Discussion**

There will be Nano doors as part of a new bar and restaurant. The applicant is working with commercial window manufactures to design windows that the Park Service will approve. There is no historic bulkhead with this building. The Park Services major concern is with the size of the mullions. A preliminary review has been done with expected approval in the next few weeks. Applicant is seeking input on the sidewalk café and if there are any issues with the Nana Wall. JM – entry is through one door, possibly a second entry or interesting signage to make certain there is more of a street presence. The Commission thought that the project looked great.

**Result**

Conceptual only.

## V. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness

### Case# 6 16-1-6

2:08:30

**Address:** 405 Neil Avenue

**Applicant:** Scott Stienecker

**Property Owner:** Steve Lark, Nationwide Realty Investors

**Design Professionals:** HOK

**Request** CC3359.07 (D)

Certificate of Appropriateness for graphics.

#### **Discussion**

Brand change as naming rights have expired – to Express Live. Sign changes on front façade as well as west and north facades. The brick on the front façade will be painted black (to go with the Express branding) and wash lighting in LED blue added. DP – motion JM – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

#### **Result**

Motion to approve. (6-0)

### Case#7 16-1-7

2:13:30

**Address:** 70 Goodale Street

**North Convention Center Parking Garage**

**Applicant and Property Owner:** Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority

**Design Professionals:** Designer Sign Systems (Blaine, Minnesota), NBBJ – architect for the garage  
Schooley Caldwell –Architect for the Convention Center Expansion

**Request** CC3359.07 (A)

Certificate of Appropriateness for graphics, three signs:

- A. Monument sign
- B. Projecting sign
- C. Halo effect wall sign over entry

*The Convention Center Garage was approved by the Downtown Commission in July 2014. One of the conditions of approval was that signage will come back to the Commission for approval.*

Loversidge recusing – Mike Lusk , acting as Chair

#### **Discussion**

These signs are a part of a much larger Convention Center project, the bulk of which will be brought to the Commission in the near future. The projected opening of the garage is this February. The signs will be internally illuminated. Motion to accept MB – TH – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

#### **Result -**

Motion to approve. (5-1-0) Loversidge recusing

**Case#8 16-1-8**

2:18:10

**Address:** 5 E. Long St., 114 N. High St.**High / Long Building****Applicant and Design Professional:** DaNite Sign Co., Mark Rubcich**Property Owner:** Leatherbuck LLC**Request** CC3359.07 (A)

Certificate of Appropriateness for multi-tenant graphics possibly including same sign for leasing.

A.) 4 blade signs centered on columns on N. High St.,

B.) 4 blade signs centered on columns on E. Long St.

**Discussion**

DaNite – MR – 8 sign, tenant panels are proposed, 4 on E. Long and 4 on High. Signs will be aluminum – painted black with white lettering / logos. RL – are these signs larger than the existing blade sign? A – No, the signs are also not lit. The corner sign is. The “For Lease” sign will not occur. If there is no tenant, it will be blank (black). JM – I think it works, my only suggestion is that you have all of the signs oriented in the same direction. RL – are you willing to condition the approval on the sign must be white on black and that there won’t be a “For Lease” sign. MB – my only concern is that this sign is in conflict with the other vertical sign and with the building’s architecture. TH – I like how simple they are, they are not competing with the corner sign, you could have the frame black to make it simpler. ML – suggest that they be mounted a little bit lower, that would make the High-Long sign more prominent. MB – drop them all about 3 feet, ML to a couple of feet above the horizontal band, RL – so that they are clearly subservient to the red sign. TH – could you also make them a little bit shorter? Don’t have it look like it is sitting on the ledge. RL – DaNite – submit revised drawing to staff. MB – motion to accept pending altered drawing to staff, TH – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Result**

Motion to approved pending the submission to staff of a revised drawing showing

- Move new signs down just above cornice
- Edge / trim to be black
- There will be no “For Lease” signs. Blank black instead

(6-0)

**Case #9 16-1-9**

2:27:24

**Address:** 150 South High Street**deNOVO bistro** (at HighPoint)**Applicant:** deNOVO bistro**Property Owner:** Kelley Companies**Attorney:** Steve Miller, Crabbe Brown & James, LLP**Design Professional:** Lisa Snyder, Neighborhood Design Center**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for the storefront and sidewalk café. CC3359.05(C)1)

**Discussion**

deNOVO is currently across High Street adjacent to the Trautman Building, currently under construction and plans to move to their new location at HighPoint in April. A –

(deNOVO) – distributed new packet of revised drawings. Canopy and other signage are now connected by portal posts. RL – is the new proposal an awning? Yes, originally the signs were going project out 2 ft. They are now going to come out about 8 ft. MB – is the sidewalk area covered? A – it will be like what Pure Pressed has with slats in between. JM – how far out does the canopy come out? Where are the columns? The fence is supported by the columns (p.3). City R.O.W. has been talked to about encroachment into sidewalk. TH – streetscape standards, there is a vision as to how this should look. 30 inches from the curb, 6 or 7 feet clearance. Between planter curb and sidewalk café fence. A - The entire construction of canopy is metal, automotive paint will be used. Lighting will be on the bottom of the sign will be low voltage LED. Fencing will be original iron fencing, will be stripped and painted. RL – I’m still confused about what the metal signage band is, whether it had a roof. (2<sup>nd</sup> one in the middle of the sheet, 3<sup>rd</sup> page on the spiral bound submission). A - Metal band similar to Pure Pressed. TH – slats are almost like arbor. MB – face is a flat piece of iron, not an I beam? 2 ft 6 in. high? A – 2 ft. with an extra 4 inches where the lights will go.

RL – you are going to have to have more definitive drawings in order to get a permit. This was intended to be for final approval, opening is supposed to take place in April. RL – are we satisfied that we have enough detail to approve? We’ve had issues with this building and we want to see that the ground floor will follow through. Right now, we are not really understanding what we are getting. I think it looks great, it is fun, exciting, but I sure like to see real detail. A – the company doing this is Thomas Bol. They are producing CAD drawings. Once they have the drawings, I’ll be happy to send them on. Desired construction start is February 15. Include samples, i.e., what are the windows, samples. Color and spacing of windows. Work with staff. TH – motion to table.

## Result

Tabled pending submission of more detail (6-0)

## Case #10 16-1-10

2:41:30

**Address:** 132 South High Street

**Condado** (at HighPoint)

**Applicant:** Joe Kahn - Condado

**Property Owner:** Kelley Companies

**Design Professional :** David Kerr

## Request:

Certificate of Appropriateness for storefront, signage and patio. CC3359.05(C)1)

## Discussion

The proposal also calls for a patio (*not* in City R.O.W.) on the side of the building. It presents some topographic issues, in that the land currently slopes down towards Columbus Commons. Joe Kahn – also has place in the Short North and also had some in Cleveland, explained concept of restaurant – Mexican themed restaurant anxious about a downtown location. Dave Kerr – new handout (revision). Seeking approval for storefront, patio and graphics. **Storefront** – Kawneer storefront, clear anodized frames, insulated glass – frames at top and bottom, insulated glass, butt jointed; entrance in center. **Graphics and signage** – smaller sign above the entrance; (blade sign?) cut, steel painted;



vinyl graphics that goes across the storefront. **Patio** – 20 x 60, about 3 ft. slope difference from one end to the other. A retaining wall will be done. There will be a brick veneer that matches the brick on the building. There will be brick piers with a limestone cap. Railings – steel painted with Mexican “Night of the Dead” motif (skulls), as well as skull finials on top of each pier. Intended to be fun and bring interest to the streetscape.

MB – one drawing shows patio with High St. entrance, another without. DK – there will be a High Street entrance, floor plan shows the capacity of over 100. There will have to be two entrances, one main entrance off of High St. The patio will be flat. JM – will the same decorative railing be used in the back portion of the patio. DK – around the perimeter. RL - How much space is there to the north to the next building (5<sup>th</sup> / 3<sup>rd</sup> Bldg.)? A – 45 ft. between buildings. MB / RL – remember the disputes about this space. Who owns this property? A – we are leasing it from Kelley. RL – will you have any way to get down to the Commons? A – No, we wouldn’t mind having it.

RL – canopy over the door is metal? A – Yes. Does sign face return back to the building? I can’t tell from the section. A. the band that sways tacos, margaritas will return. Within that is a light box with changing LED that shines both up and down. JM – talk about the 3-D dimensional art panel. Is it applied on to the masonry? Is it recessed? A – this is still being designed. It will be a steel panel that is mounted ON WOOD and will have some relief. And will be painted for effect. Lighting is still being explored (back lighting). The blade sign is not lit. MB – planters and motif is good, and I’m glad local entrepreneurs will be going into the building. I’m concerned that the planters / finials might receive abuse. I don’t know if you really need them. Maybe put them at a higher level on the building (creative and cool). Patio will be poured concrete.

RL – I think this is all fabulous, but like the last one, it needs more detail. What are actually going to build. Sections through the retaining wall, for example. Time frame is mid-April opening. RL – you need to have more drawings to get a permit. We were planning on submitting for permit in three weeks. RL – you are hearing nothing but positive comments. ML – Materials and samples. RL – include a site plan – a little more context 9relationship to the adjacent building..

## **Result**

Motion to table pending more detail (6-0)

## **VI.Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Advertising Mural**

### **Case #11 16-1-11M**

2:57:47

#### **Hollywood Casino Ad Mural**

#### **55 E. Spring Street**

**Applicant:** Outfront Media

**Property Owner:** Stickmen Properties Ltd. c/o Richard T. Day

**Design Professional:** Outfront Media

**Request:**

Design review and approval for installation of vinyl mesh advertising murals to be located on the north elevation at 55 E. Spring St. Proposed mural – Hollywood Casino. There will be three murals, a total length of 120' W x 28' H. The murals will be divided by exposed brick. The Downtown Commission has previously approved numerous murals at this location, the latest being for another Hollywood Casino. CC3359.07(D)

**Dimensions of mural:** left and right 45' W x 28' H, center 28' H x 26' H. Two dimensional, lit

**Term of installation:** Seeking approval from February 1 through December 31, 2016

**Area of mural:** 3248 sf

**Approximate % of area that is text:** 1.3%

**Discussion**

There was some confusion in that the proportion of the art did not fit the current area. There was also a desire for more specificity on the new lighting.

**Result**

Tabled pending more detail.

**VII. Business / Discussion**

- Requested letter of support for affordable housing at 562 Main St. (Homeport) Plans to be submitted at a later date. (Handout) 3:10:28  
*This will be part of the application for low-income tax credit. This is not for architectural review at this time. RL – I think it is awesome. MB – do we have a plan for density in that area? DJT – The Discovery District completed a Southeast Gateway Plan in 2013 and this is largely compliant. MB – I'm all for it, affordability is important, I would like to know that the Commission is respecting any community plan. Suggestion that the Discovery District SID has been made aware and that other community stakeholders are involved. Motion to write a letter drafted by staff and signed by the chair in support of the Discovery Flats. (6-0).*
- Parklet proposal in parking space in front of Café Brioso at the corner of Gay and High. Will be at Art Commission for conceptual review this evening. (Handout) 1:13:17  
*Staff showed the Commission a proposal to take the parallel parking space at the corner of Gay and High Streets for the temporary use of a "parklet" in the Spring of 2016. This will ultimately receive the approval of Public Services, and also the Art Commission, since it is in the Public R.O.W. and will have commissioned art. The Downtown Commission supported the program.*
- Extension of Apple Ad Mural program – distribution of February murals. (Handout)  
*Staff showed current ad mural submissions for the Apple murals. The Commission voiced that this has been a successful program and elected to continue authorizing staff issuance of Certificates for 2016. They voiced some concern over expansion of the proportion of text.*

**Public Forum**

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last meeting (September 22, 2015)

1. 101 E. Town St. – Primrose Daycare signage – reissue.
2. 78 E. Chestnut St. – roofing
3. 325 E. Long St. – Jimmy John's, sidewalk café referral

4. Flats on Vine – Arena District Parking signage
5. 445 N. Front St. – Arena District Parking signage
6. Arena District – Parking signage on School St. and Convention Center Drive
7. Arnold Classic – banners in R.O.W. referral
8. 80 S. Sixth St. – Lamar Waterfall mural

**If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 645-8404.**

3:22:33